REMARKS

I.   Introduction

Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, and 36 have been amended (underlining indicating added text). No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5 to 10, 12 to 17, 19, 21 to 26, 28 to 34, and 36 to 39 are now pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 10, 12 to 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24 to 26, 28 to 30, 32 to 34, and 36 to 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 10, 12 to 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24 to 26, 28 to 30, 32 to 34, and 36 to 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0133546 ("the Oni reference") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061482 ("the Emmerichs reference"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not render unpatentable any of these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, relates to a method of managing visibility of GUI components in an application, and provides, *inter alia*, the following:

> for displaying a user interface screen of the application
> according to an applied one of the plurality of profiles:
> > initializing the application, wherein the initializing includes:
> > > starting the application; and
> > > building the user interface screen of the application with
> > all of the GUI components set as visible;
> > invoking the visibility manager to:
> > > determine, based on the selected visibility states of the
> > applied profile, which of the GUI components of the built
> > interface are to be set as not visible; and
> > > . . . revise the built user interface screen based on the
> > determination; and
> > displaying the revised user interface screen of the
> application.

The Oni reference merely indicates that a user profile may dynamically change and that user interfaces displayed over time may differ based on the changes to the profile. However, the changes are not to a generated interface, but rather between interfaces generated at different times, *i.e.*, each interface generation via a separate instantiation of an interface generation method for generation of a new interface and each generated for a

different profile – the profile before it is changed and the profile after it is changed. The Oni reference does not disclose or suggest an interface generation method that includes, for a particular display of a particular interface according to an applied profile, initially generating an interface with all GUI components set as visible and then revising the generated interface according to a profile.

The Office Action refers to par. 54 of the Emmerichs reference as assertedly disclosing initially building a user interface that includes all GUI components set as visible and subsequently revising the user interface based on a profile for display of the user interface in accordance with a profile. The cited section refers to an embodiment in which user interface components corresponding to widgets to which a user does not have access are displayed. In response to selection of those user interface components, the user is notified of the access denial. Thus, the Emmerichs reference does not refer to revising an interface screen, but rather to display of an interface screen without regard to a profile and then a subsequent output of a separate message regarding the attempt to access an unauthorized widget. Therefore, even if the Oni reference is modified to include the features of the Emmerichs reference, the modified system does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the Oni reference to include the features of the Emmerichs reference to obtain a modified system in which an initial GUI is provided to the user while a profile is loading. However, the prior art does not suggest any desire or benefit for such a feature. Indeed, display of an initial GUI as suggested by the Examiner probably would serve only to increase processing time. The suggested modification is therefore based on nothing more than improper hindsight reasoning in view of the present application.

Further, claim 1 has been amended herein without prejudice to clarify that the built user interface screen is revised based on an applied profile prior to any display of the built user interface screen. Thus, even if the Oni reference is modified, as suggested by the Office Action, to initially display a GUI and then modify the displayed GUI, the modified system of the Oni reference would still not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, so that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs reference does not render unpatentable claim 1 or any of its dependent claims, e.g., claims 2, 5, 6, and 8.

Independent claim 9, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 9 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 10, 12 to 14, and 16, are therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

As further regards claim 9 and its dependent claims, claim 9 provides that for display of a <u>single</u> user interface screen, the screen is initially built and then revised. The Office Action suggests a combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references where a first screen is displayed while a profile is loading and a second, revised, screen is displayed after the profile is loaded. Thus, the suggested combination does not disclose or suggest the building and modification for display of a <u>single</u> screen, as provided for in the context of claim 9. For this additional reason, the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 9, so that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references des not render unpatentable claim 9 or any of its dependent claims for this additional reason.

Independent claim 17, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 17 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 19, 21, 22, and 24, are therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 25, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 25 and its dependent claims, e.g., claims 26, 28 to 30, and 32, are therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 33, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 33 and its dependent claim 34 are therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 36, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 36 and its dependent claims 37 to 39 are therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

As further regards claim 36 and its dependent claims, claim 36 provides that, during the building of the data structure by an application, and responsive to a start-up of a visibility manager, the visibility manager selects one of a plurality of interface profiles, each of the interface profiles indicating for each of a plurality of interface components a respective visibility instruction. Claim 36 further provides that the visibility manager is subsequently called by the application, responsive to which the data structure is modified. The combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not disclose or suggest the interaction between components as provided for in the context of claim 36.

For example, the Office Action refers to par. 65 of the Oni reference as assertedly disclosing a visibility manager selecting a profile prior to being called and during the building of a data structure. However, while the cited section of the Oni reference may generally refer to generation of a user-optimal layout in accordance with a profile, the cited section does not disclose any component selecting a profile while another component builds a data structure. Further, the cited section also does not disclose any component that selects a profile prior to its being called. Instead, the Oni reference provides that, in response to detection of a change to a profile, a GUI is changed. Thus, in the Oni reference, a component which selects a profile is not disclosed as being subsequently called by another component. Instead, a single component detects changes to a profile and responsively updates a GUI.

The Emmerichs reference does not correct this critical deficiency of the Oni reference. In this regard, the Emmerichs reference provides for display of a user interface screen which is not generated in accordance with a profile. Subsequently, if an unauthorized user attempts access of a widget, a message is output. A component in the Emmerichs reference that checks the user profile does so after generation of an interface screen, and not during building of a data structure as provided for in claim 36. Thus, while the Emmerichs reference may provide for checking a user profile and outputting a message in accordance with the profile subsequent to display of an initial user interface screen, the Emmerichs reference does not disclose any component that performs those operations that performs the selection of a profile during the building of the initial screen or a corresponding data structure.

For this additional reason, the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 36, so that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references des not render unpatentable claim 36 or any of its dependent claims for this additional reason.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

III.   Rejection of Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of the Oni reference, the Emmerichs reference, and U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 ("the Moshfeghi reference"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Oni, Emmerichs, and Moshfeghi references does not render unpatentable these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, since the Moshfeghi reference does not correct the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to the Oni and Emmerichs references. In this regard, while the Moshfeghi reference relates to restricting access only to allowed browser interface functions and refers to use of Java classes for specifying browser interface components according to a profile, the Moshfeghi reference does not disclose or suggest, for example, initially building a user interface that includes all GUI components set as visible and subsequently revising the user interface based on a profile for display of the user interface in accordance with a profile, as provided for in the contexts of claims 1, 9, 17, and 25.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that any outstanding rejections of the claims should be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: <u>August 29, 2008</u>   By: <u>Aaron Grunberger</u>
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: (212) 425-7200